GCMD Keywords Review Package

I. Keyword Materials

- Documents (Version 1)
    - Overview and Questionnaire
    - GCMD Keyword Spreadsheet
- Modify Materials in Response To Feedback (Version 2)
    - GCMD Water Vapor Keywords Spreadsheet
    - Keyword Review Google Form
- Modify Materials in Response To Feedback (Version 3)
    - GCMD Water Vapor Keywords Spreadsheet
    - Keyword Review Google Form
- Modify Materials To Cover Both Keyword Sets (Version 4)
    - GCMD Science Keyword Release Version 8.5 (Water Vapor and Winds)
    - Keyword Review Google Form
- Live dry run at winter ESIP - Katie
- Modified Materials (Version 5: Based on Dry Run Feedback)
    - GCMD_Science_Keywords_8.5_Final_ESO.xlsx
    - Keyword Review Google Form

II. Discuss Elements and Responsibilities

Element	Who	Status
Keyword Review Package	GCMD	Done
Keyword Proposal Spreadsheet	GCMD	Done
Existing Keywords Spreadsheet	GCMD	Done
Invitation Email To Keyword Reviewers	ESO	
Collect Reviewer Feedback	ESO	
Follow-up Telecon To Discuss Review	ESO	
Modify Materials in Response To Feedback	GCMD	Done
Iteratively Review and Refine Materials	GCMD/ESO	In Work

III. Establish a dry-run schedule

- Once we have agreement on the updated materials, GCMD is ready to go.

IV. Dry Run Feedback

Reviewer	Feedback	Response	Status

Daniel Ziskin (ziskin@ucar.edu)	My main feeling was that it wasn't clear how to begin. I stumbled along without confidence in the beginning. I would have liked to see some simple instructions like: 1) Download this Excel spreadsheet (please notice that there are multiple sheets) 2) Review the proposed changes 3) Submit this questionnaire Many times I got confused about Level 1 parameters or Level 2 or what. When I returned to the spreadsheet it made sense but the phrasing of the questions when I first read was baffling. I had to flip back and forth too many times for the question to make sense. I would suggest adding some kind of pictorial representation of the current and proposed changes on the questionnaire itself. When I was filling out the questionnaire the question would be something like "Do you approve of the proposed change of moving Variable Level 2 Convective Surface Wind to Variable Level 3?" I just remember feeling very confused trying to keep all the Levels straight in my head and going back-and-forth between the form and the spreadsheet. The Level numbers just didn't help me.	• Reorganized the steps on how to complete the review into clear and concise statements • Updated text in introduction • Added statement regarding the keyword hierarchy and levels • Will add a better snapshot that conveys the keyword hierarchy	Done
John Scialdone (jscialdo@ciesin.columbia.edu)	Q4: Recommends Humidity Indicators at Variable Level 1 instead of Humidity Expressions Q5: Recommends to split Convergence/Divergence into separate Variable Level 2 Words (e.g. Convergence, Divergence) Q6: Capitalize p in profile in the Velocity Azimuth Display Vertical Wind profile (e.g. Velocity Azimuth Display Vertical Wind Profile) Recommends to split - Mountain-Valley Breezes into separate Variable Level 3 Words (e.g. Mountain Breezes, Valley Breezes) - Sea-Land Breeze into separate Variable Level 3 Words (e.g. Sea Breezes, Land Breezes - make the Breeze plural)	• Making a few revisions to the keywords based on the initial dry-run comments and those will be incorporated into the final review spreadsheet.	Done
Deborah Smith (dks0017@uah.edu)	• I am not sure everyone will know what "Ensure the keywords at each level are parallel in scope" means • When you make this statement " The number of records in the Common Metadata Repository (CMR) impacted by the keyword change " it is the first time you are saying CMR and some people may not know what this is. Research scientists don't encounter the CMR much. They have just been told they are working on the GCMD Keywords.... so what does this have to do with CMR records and why do I care? • Change this " PLEASE NOTE THAT YOUR RESPONSES WILL NOT BE SAVED OR RECORDED UNTIL YOU CLICK 'SUBMIT' AT THE END OF THE REVIEW. IF YOU CLOSE THE FORM, YOUR RESPONSES WILL NOT BE SAVED." to "NOTE: You must **click submit for all responses to be saved**. The submit button is at the end of the form." • This makes sure they can't miss the direction for "Are the keywords appropriate in characterizing the data?" the question is not clear. What data? Water Vapor in general or that specific quantity (such as evapotransporation)? • This question " Is it appropriate to move the Water Vapor Processes keywords to Variable Level 2? (Example: Move 'Condensation' from Variable Level 1 to Variable Level 2) If no, please comment below." will only be understood if the reviewer knows the difference and purpose of Level 1 and Level 2. If they are not at all familiar with it, then they have to read more before answering. Suggest putting a link to further description right at this question so they do not have to go in search for it. • What if the reviewer does not know the answer to the question (they do not feel it is within their scope of understanding or they do not feel knowledgeable enough to answer)? You do not have a 'Yes', 'No', 'I don't know' radial button selection. • keyword comments ◦ wind chill is not a wind keyword, but rather a temperature keyword ◦ the orographic winds list contains some locally named winds, but certainly not all. ie. list Santa Ana Wind but not Diablo wind (the equivalent in the SF Bay Area as opposed to Southern CA). Unless you want to include all, I would stay away from local names and instead focus on general types	• Provided additional explanation and an example on what '"Ensure the keywords at each level are parallel in scope" means • Changed CMR records to 'number of collection records affected. Removed other references to the word CMR • Changed the response text to 'NOTE: YOU MUST CLICK 'SUBMIT' AT THE END OF FORM FOR ALL RESPONSES TO BE SAVED. IF YOU CLOSE THE FORM, YOUR RESPONSES WILL NOT BE SAVED.' • Cleaned up the questions as noted and added an option for 'I don't know'. • Making a few revisions to the keywords based on the initial dry-run comments and those will be incorporated into the final review spreadsheet.	Done
	.		

V. Keyword Review Feedback

Google Form Feedback:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/11KuUGYF6Pt0F8nbZL6S0jztKtDLrgE8SJoo72bKVZ_0/edit?usp=sharing

Email Feedback:

Reviewer	Feedback	Response	Status
Dave Connell (Dave.Connell@aad.gov.au)	1. Can the proposed keywords be used to accurately describe datasets? YES. 2. Are the keywords appropriate as search terms? YES. 3. Does moving the Water Vapor Processes keywords…? YES. 4. Does moving the Water Vapor Indicators keywords…? YES. 5. Does moving the Wind Dynamics keywords…? YES. 6. Does moving the Surface Winds and Upper Level Winds keywords…? YES. 7. Does each keyword listed in the keywords review spreadsheet…? NO. I disagree with the addition of "Santa Ana Winds", "Gap Winds", "Mistral Winds" and to a lesser extent, "Chinook Winds". My personal feeling is that these are too specific, as they are relevant to only a small geographical area. Researchers in these areas should use a more generic wind keyword, and then qualify that with a location keyword, or an ancillary keyword. I say "Chinook" to a lesser extent, because it pertains to a much larger geographical area. 8. Do you have any recommendations for modifications…? NO. Other than what I referred to in point 7. 9. Do you have any recommendations for additions…? NO.		
Gao Chen (gao.chen@nasa.gov)	I felt it is more logical to describe the atmospheric water starting from its physical state, i.e., water vapor and condensed water. The latter can also be referred as cloud water. The Document1.docx is my attempt to organize keywords/variables in this way. Some entries listed in the spreadsheet are too specific and can be organized under the categories in the attached table. For example, the water vapor profiles are just one type of the measurement data, not a different physical quantity to me. I am not an expert on atmospheric water and probably missed some important entries. Also, saturation mixing ratio is a function ambient temperature, not related to actual water vapor content. The saturation deficit or dew point deficit are indirect measures of the atmospheric water vapor content. I believe we should consult the water measurement and modeling community before we finalize these keywords.		